

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

JEREMY BLANK,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 19-cv-534

TAMMY POESCHL,

Defendant.

ORDER

Pro se plaintiff Jeremy Blank filed his fourth discovery related motion. (ECF No. 29.) He requests an “in camera inspection” of defendant’s discovery responses. (*Id.*) As this court has explained many times, Blank must confer with opposing counsel in good faith before filing discovery related motions and he must identify a basis in fact for suspecting that defendant is not properly satisfying discovery obligations. (*See* ECF Nos. 23, 30.) Blank has done neither. (ECF No. 31.) Instead, he continues to assert that opposing counsel is violating ethical rules and conferring with her would be futile. (ECF No. 33.) The court will require Blank to contact opposing counsel about this particular discovery dispute before seeking the court’s assistance. Accordingly, the court will deny his motion for an in camera inspection.

Before Blank files another discovery related motion, he must attach evidence showing that he sent opposing counsel correspondence attempting to resolve the specific discovery issue he is complaining about in that motion. He must also attach

opposing counsel's response so that the court knows what the disagreement is about. Finally, Blank should be aware that on April 9, 2020, Chief Judge Pamela Pepper issued a General Order staying discovery deadlines during the time period the Governor's Safer at Home Order was in effect and extending the deadlines to 45 days after the Safer at Home Order was lifted. This means that opposing counsel still has time to respond to Blank's correspondences and discovery requests.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the plaintiff's motion for in camera inspection (ECF No. 29) is **DENIED**.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 20th day of May, 2020.

BY THE COURT:

s/Nancy Joseph
NANCY JOSEPH
United States Magistrate Judge